

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to a non-final Office Action dated October 20, 2004. Prior to this amendment claims 1-35 were pending. Claims 1, 4-12, 16-17, 19, 22-27, 29-30 and 34 have been amended. Claims 2-3, 18, 20-21 and 35 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 4-17, 19 and 22-34 are pending.

The Office Action indicated that claims 3-17 and 21-34 would be allowable if claims 3 and 21 were rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitations of dependent claim 3 and intervening claim 2. Claim 19 has been amended to include all of the limitations of dependent claim 21 and intervening claim 20. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1 and 19 are now in condition for allowance. Further, claims 4-18 and 22-34, which depend from claims 1 and 19, respectively, are now in condition for allowance.

Regarding independent method claim 1 and independent system claim 19, the applicant has reorganized several of the limitations to more clearly show the relationships between the steps and components. Further, the applicant has amended the claims to clarify some antecedent basis issues and to change the plural form of "the dynamic instruction sets" to the singular form, "the dynamic instruction set". The applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1, 4-17, 19 and 22-34 remain allowable as amended.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-2, 18-20 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moles et al., U.S. Pat. Appl. Pub. No. 2002/0072359 A1. The applicant respectfully disagrees. However, to expedite prosecution, the applicant has cancelled claims 2-3, 18, 20-21 and 35 and amended claims 1 and 19 to include all of the limitations of allowable claims 3 and 21 and any intervening claims. Accordingly, the rejections with respect to claims 1-2, 18-20 and 35 are moot. The applicant reserves the right to prosecute the subject matter of claims 1-2, 18-20 and 35 in this or another patent application.


The applicant has considered the references that were made of record by the Office Action. The applicant asserts that the claimed invention is patentably distinct from the cited references.

CONCLUSION

The applicant respectfully requests an early allowance of pending claims 1, 4-17, 19 and 22-34.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Dec 29, 2004

By: 
Jonathan T. Velasco, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 42,200

Jonathan T. Velasco, Esq.
KYOCERA WIRELESS CORP.
P.O. Box 928289
San Diego, California 92192-8289
Direct Dial: (858) 882-3501
Direct Fax: (858) 882-2485